

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 are currently pending in the application. Claims 1, 3, 6-7, 9 and 13 are rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over US Pat. No. 6,098,091 to Kisor (hereafter "Kisor") in view of US Pat. No. 6,202,096 to Williams (hereafter "Williams"). Claims 10, 14, and 15 are rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Kisor in view Williams and US Pat. Publ. No. 2002/0198924 to Akashi et al. (hereafter "Akashi"). Claim 12 is rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Akashi in view of Williams. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Kisor in view of Williams and US Patent No. 6,779,016 to Aziz et al. (hereafter "Aziz"). Claims 2, 4, 5, 8, and 11 include allowable subject matter but are objected to as being based upon a rejected base claim.

CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 USC 103

Claims 1, 3, 6-7, 9 and 13 are rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over US Pat. No. 6,098,091 to Kisor (hereafter "Kisor") in view of US Pat. No. 6,202,096 to Williams (hereafter "Williams"). Claims 10, 14, and 15 are rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Kisor in view Williams and US Pat. Publ. No. 2002/0198924 to Akashi et al. (hereafter "Akashi"). Claim 12 is rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Akashi in view of Williams. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Kisor in view of Williams and US Patent No. 6,779,016 to Aziz et al. (hereafter "Aziz").

Claims 1, 6, 9, 12, and 13 are amended herein to include the allowable limitation of claim 2.

Claim 2 is canceled.

Claims 3-5 depend from claim 1, claims 7-8 depend from claim 6, claims 10-11 depend from claim 9, and claims 14-16 depend from claim 13. Applicant respectfully contends that they are allowable for the reasons that claims 1, 6, 9, and 13 are allowable.

Applicant respectfully contends that claims 4, 8, 11, and 15 are also allowable because they include another feature that is neither disclosed nor suggested by Kisor, Akashi, or any other reference, either alone or in combination. Claim 4 includes the feature "at least one agent section sends a first job execution request received from the scheduler section to the corresponding process server in response to polling access from the corresponding process server, and at least one second agent section sends a second job execution request received from the scheduler section to the corresponding process server in a push type scheduling scheme at timing managed by the second agent section". Claim 8 includes the related feature "a first one of the agent sections provides a request for execution of the corresponding job to a first one of the computers

constituting the system in response to polling accesses from the first one of the computers, and at least a second one of the agent sections provides a request for execution of the corresponding job to a second one of the computers in a push scheduling scheme at timing managed by the agent sections". Claim 11 includes the related feature "the agent section sends a request for execution of the job issued by the scheduler section to at least a first one of the computers in response to polling accesses from the computers, and sends a request for execution of the job issued by the scheduler section to at least a second one of the other computers in a push scheduling scheme at timing managed by the agent section". Claim 15 includes the related feature "to send the request to at least a first one of a plurality of process servers in response to polling accesses from the process servers, and send the request to at least a second one of a plurality of process servers at timing managed by the computer".

In the present application, agent sections send job execution requests both: (1) to a first process server (computer) in response to polling accesses from the first process server (pull scheduling) and (2) to a second process server (computer) at timing managed by the agent (push scheduling). None of the references teach combining push scheduling and pull scheduling in the same grid computing system. Kisor and Akashi both describe push scheduling systems. Each are complete grid computing systems, and neither suggests combining pull scheduling and push scheduling according to access types of the process servers.

The Examiner argues that Kisor discloses sending a job execution request to a process server in response to polling from the process server at Col. 2, lines 24-30 and Col. 6, line 35. However, the cited text describes the central computer polling remote computers (i.e., process servers) for availability information not the process server polling the center server to provide access.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and arguments presented herein, Applicant respectfully contends that claims 1 and 3-16 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests entry of the amendments, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1 and 3-16 and issuance of letters patent.

Respectfully Submitted,



Steven E. Bach
Attorney for the Applicant
Reg. No. 46,530